

## REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action (hereinafter "the Action") dated July 24, 2008. In the Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-20 were pending and that claims 1-8 had been previously withdrawn. The Examiner rejected pending claims 9-20 as discussed individually below.

Claims 9-20 were pending in this application. Claim 15 has been canceled without prejudice, and claims 9-12 have been amended. In view of the arguments set forth below, claims 9-14 and 16-20 are allowable, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection and issue a Notice of Allowance.

### I. CLAIM REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable in view of United States Patent No. 4,974,752 to *Sirek*, rejected claims 11, 15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sirek* in view of United States Patent No. 5,979,794 to *DeFillipi et al.*, rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sirek* in view of United States Patent No. 5,188,259 to *Petit* and rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of *Sirek* in view of United States Patent No. 4,889,440 to *Shano*.

#### A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9, 10, 14, 16 AND 17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,974,752 to *Sirek*. The Examiner stated that *Sirek* discloses the elements of the claimed invention. In addition, the Examiner stated that with respect to using the device, it has been held that the manner in which a claimed invention is to be used does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations.

Claim 9 is directed to "a device for producing a workable material usable to support components in a generator . . . ." The device disclosed in *Sirek* does not anticipate amended claim 9. In particular, claim 9 has been amended to state, in relevant part:

at least one mixing chamber coupled to the housing for mixing a workable material with at least one catalyst;

a first container positioned in the housing for containing the workable material;

a second container positioned in the housing for containing the at least one catalyst;

a first ejector coupled to the housing and in contact with the first container for ejecting the workable material from the first container into the at least one mixing chamber;

a second ejector coupled to the housing and in contact with the second container for ejecting the workable material from the second container into the at least one mixing chamber.

In contrast, the cited reference does not disclose a container housing a workable material and another container housing catalyst material. Furthermore, the cited reference does not disclose two ejectors that operate independently, as claimed. Finally, the cited reference does

not disclose a device for producing a workable material usable to support components in a generator. Instead, the cited reference discloses merely a heated caulk gun. Such disclosure is not the claimed invention. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 9, and those claims depending therefrom, are allowable, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

**B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11, 15 AND 18-20  
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,974,752 to *Sirek* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,979,794 to *DeFillipi et al.* The Examiner states that *Sirek* discloses all claimed features, but fails to show an air driven piston and a mixer for mixing two components. The Examiner stated that *DeFillipi et al.* discloses a dispenser for hot adhesive actuated by a pneumatic piston and cylinder and a mixing element to mix two components. The Examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the device of *Sirek* with the features of *DeFillipi et al.* to yield the patented invention.

The pending patent application is directed to a system for creating blocks between adjacent stator coils. The conventional process is very time consuming to install braces between the stator coils. Claim 18 in contrast, is directed to a more efficient system in which the braces may be formed in place in the void between adjacent stator coils. In particular, claim 18 is directed to "[a] system for supporting components in a generator . . . a device for

emitting a workable material between adjacent components of a generator to secure the components . . . a first generator component coupled to a generator and a second generator component coupled to the generator adjacent to the first generator component, wherein the first and second generator components are separated by a void." In contrast, neither *Sirek* nor *DeFillipi et al.* disclose a system for supporting components in a generator. In addition, neither *Sirek* nor *DeFillipi et al.* disclose generator components positioned such that a void exists between the components, as claimed. Neither cited reference discloses any suggestion or motivation for the claimed invention and the generator elements that form a portion of the system for supporting components in a generator. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 18, and those claims depending therefrom, are allowable, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

**C. REJECTION OF CLAIM 12 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under *Sirek* in view of *Petit*. Claim 12 depends from claim 9, which is allowable as previously discussed. Thus, for at least those reasons, claim 12 is allowable, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

**D. REJECTION OF CLAIM 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**


The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under *Sirek* in view of *Shano*. Claim 13 depends from claim 9, which is allowable as previously discussed. Thus, for at least those reasons, claim 13 is allowable, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

### CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons given above, claims 9-14 and 16-20 define patentable subject matter and are thus allowable. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

No fees are believed due; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. Dixon  
Reg. No. 46,665  
AKERMAN SENTERFITT  
222 Lakeview Avenue  
Suite 400  
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401-6183  
(561) 653-5000

Attorney Docket No.: 2003P11239US